

**Application No.: 10/679,365**

**REMARKS**

Claims 2, 14 and 31 are objected to for minor informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the enclosed amendment obviates the alleged informalities. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 20 are independent and stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Takahashi et al. '449 ("Takahashi"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Each of claims 1 and 20 embody a circuit block including a plurality of components *each of which is a gate circuit*, wherein at least one of the plurality of components is *supplied* with a voltage having a value different from that supplied to the other component or components. In contrast, the alleged components of Takahashi relied on by the Examiner and shown in Figure 1 thereof *generate* the referenced voltages of 12v and 5v, etc.. The alleged components are not *supplied* with the referenced voltages of 12v and 5v, etc.. Indeed, Takahashi is directed to a power generating unit, which includes a plurality of power circuits for generating a plurality of different voltages from a voltage applied to an input portion (*see* Fig. 1). Specifically, Takahashi discloses an equivalent circuit of a power source for obtaining a 5V source for a control circuit, a 12V source for supplying a backlight for use in an LCD display, and a -22V source for driving a printing machine. However, Takahashi fails to disclose or suggest at least one of the plurality of alleged components being *supplied* with a voltage having a value different from that supplied to the other alleged component or components.

In addition, Takahashi further fails to disclose or suggest that the plurality of alleged components each is *a gate circuit*. In contrast, each of the alleged components disclosed in Takahashi is a circuit including a Capacitor C1, Coil L1, Diode D1 and the like, which is different from a gate circuit.

**Application No.: 10/679,365**

As anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each and every element of the claim be disclosed, either expressly or inherently (noting that "inherency may not be established by probabilities or possibilities", *Scaltech Inc. v. Retec/Tetra*, 178 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 1999)), in a single prior art reference, *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Commission*, 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986), based on the forgoing, it is submitted that Takahashi does not anticipate claims 1 and 20, nor any claim dependent thereon.

Turning to the rejections under § 103, the Examiner does not rely on any of the secondary prior art references to obviate the aforementioned deficiencies of Takahashi, so that the Examiner relies exclusively on Takahashi as allegedly disclosing the aforementioned features of the present invention. That is, the Examiner improperly interprets Takahashi as allegedly disclosing a semiconductor integrated circuit device including a circuit block with a plurality of components each of which is a gate circuit, wherein at least one of the plurality of components is supplied with a voltage having a value different from that supplied to the other component or components. Indeed, none of the cited prior art appears to obviate the aforementioned deficiencies of Takahashi. Accordingly, none of the cited prior art, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests, *inter alia*, a semiconductor integrated circuit device including a circuit block with a plurality of components each of which is a gate circuit, wherein at least one of the plurality of components is supplied with a voltage having a value different from that supplied to the other component or components.

The Examiner is directed to MPEP § 2143.03 under the section entitled "All Claim Limitations Must Be Taught or Suggested", which sets forth the applicable standard for establishing obviousness under § 103:

**Application No.: 10/679,365**

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. (citing *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)).

In the instant case, the pending rejections do not "establish *prima facie* obviousness of [the] claimed invention" as recited in the pending claims because the proposed combinations fail the "all the claim limitations" standard required under § 103.

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as claims 1 and 20 are patentable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims dependent thereon are also patentable. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are patentable based on their own merits by adding novel and non-obvious features to the combination.

For example, claim 8 recites wherein the plurality of components are divided and placed in a plurality of regions corresponding to the values of voltages to be *supplied* to the respective regions" (emphasis added). In contrast, Takashi discloses only that the alleged plurality of components *generate* the plurality of different voltages from a voltage applied to the input portion and that each of the alleged components is disposed in each area so as to be allocated to each output voltage.

As another example, claim 2 recites in pertinent part, "at least two power supplies for respectively supplying voltages having mutually different values *to the circuit block*" (emphasis added). Again, Takahashi discloses generating the referenced voltages at the alleged circuit block rather than supplying those voltages to the alleged circuit block. Moreover, Shimada '502

**Application No.: 10/679,365**

discloses only power supply lines connected to semiconductor chips IC1 and IC2 to supply power in a multi-chip module.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102/103 be withdrawn.


### **CONCLUSION**

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Ramyar M. Farid  
Registration No. 46,692

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 RMF:MaM  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: June 5, 2006**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**